

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

From the:
INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY EXAMINING AUTHORITY

Lloyd Wise Tanjong Pagar P.O Box 636 Singapore 910816		LLOYD WISE 08 JUN 2005 RECEIVED	PCT WRITTEN OPINION (PCT Rule 66)
Applicant's or agent's file reference FP1911		Date of mailing (day/month/year)	- 3 JUN 2005
International Application No. PCT/SG2003/000284	International Filing Date (day/month/year) 12 December 2003	Priority Date (day/month/year)	12 December 2003
International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC Int. Cl. ⁷ G06T 7/60, G06K 9/46		DUE DATE	
Applicant AGENCY FOR SCIENCE, TECHNOLOGY AND RESEARCH et al		<u>3/8/05</u>	ENTERED

<p>1. This written opinion is the first drawn by this International Preliminary Examining Authority.</p> <p>2. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> I <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Basis of the opinion II <input type="checkbox"/> Priority III <input type="checkbox"/> Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability IV <input type="checkbox"/> Lack of unity of invention V <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Reasoned statement under Rule 66.2(a)(ii) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement VI <input type="checkbox"/> Certain documents cited VII <input type="checkbox"/> Certain defects in the international application VIII <input type="checkbox"/> Certain observations on the international application <p>3. The FINAL DATE by which the international preliminary examination report must be established according to Rule 69.2 is: 12 April 2006</p> <p>4. The applicant is hereby invited to reply to this opinion.</p> <p>When? See the Reply Due date indicated above. However, the Australian Patent Office will not establish the Report before the earlier of (i) a response being filed, or (ii) one month before the Final Date by which the international preliminary examination report must be established. The Report will take into account any response (including amendments) filed before the Report is established. If no response is filed by 1 month before the Final Date, the international preliminary examination report will be established on the basis of this opinion. Applicants wishing to have the benefit of a further opinion (if needed) before the report is established should ensure that a response is filed at least 3 months before the Final Date by which the international preliminary examination report must be established.</p> <p>How? By submitting a written reply, accompanied, where appropriate, by amendments, according to Rule 66.3. For the form and the language of the amendments, see Rules 66.3 and 66.9.</p> <p>Also For an additional opportunity to submit amendments, see Rule 66.4. For the examiner's obligation to consider amendments and/or arguments, see Rule 66.4bis. For an informal communication with the examiner, see Rule 66.6.</p>

Name and mailing address of the IPEA/AU AUSTRALIAN PATENT OFFICE PO BOX 200, WODEN ACT 2606, AUSTRALIA E-mail address: pct@ipaaustralia.gov.au Facsimile No. (02) 6285 3929	Authorized Officer J.W. THOMSON Telephone No. (02) 6283 2214
---	---

WRITTEN OPINION

International application No.

PCT/SG2003/000284

V. Reasoned statement under Rule 66.2(a)(ii) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

1. Statement

Novelty (N)	Claims	YES
	Claims 1-30	NO
Inventive step (IS)	Claims	YES
	Claims 1-30	NO
Industrial applicability (IA)	Claims 1-30	YES
	Claims	NO

2. Citations and explanations

The following new citation is relevant:

- Hu & Nowinski, *A rapid algorithm for robust and automatic extraction of the midsagittal plane of the human cerebrum from neuroimages based on local symmetry and outlier removal*, NeuroImage, December 2003, Volume 20, Issue 4, pp 2153-2165 (see the whole document, in particular pages 2153-2157)

The invention defined in claims 1-30 is not novel and lacks inventiveness when compared with the cited document that discloses all the essential features of the invention claimed.

Hu provides a complete disclosure of the invention as defined in claims 1-30, including a method for determining the location of the MSP by calculating the AFLSs and removing outlier AFLSs, with outlier AFLSs defined as having larger angular deviation from the MSP than the predetermined threshold and inlier AFLSs defined as having smaller angular deviation from the MSP; for the purposes of identifying pathology in a brain image, substantially as claimed.

The citation was available online from 14 November 2003, from whence it is considered to be in the public domain. Therefore the invention defined in claims 1-30 do not meet the requirements for Novelty and Inventive Step.